RPI-123US

Appln. No.: 10/750,605 Amendment Dated February 14, 2008 Reply to Office Action of September 18, 2007

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings are now formal. These sheets replace the original sheets.

Attachment

Appln. No.: 10/750,605

Amendment Dated February 14, 2008

Reply to Office Action of September 18, 2007

Remarks/Arguments:

The pending claims are 42-53. Claims 1-9, 13-21, 24-41 have been withdrawn from further consideration and hereby cancelled. Claims 10-12, 22, and 23 have also been canceled. Claims 42-53 have been added. In addition, Applicant herewith submits formal drawings. No new matter is introduced in the new claims or in the formal drawings.

The rejection of claim 10 in paragraph 5 of the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is moot because claim 10 has been canceled. The rejection of claims 10-12 in paragraph 6 of the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Freeman (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,227) in view of Laves (U.S. Patent No. 6,879,996) is moot because claims 10-12 have been canceled. The rejection of claims 22-23 in paragraph 7 of the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Freeman is moot because claims 22-23 have been canceled.

Claim 42 recites, in part

...creating a first audio/video message on a first workstation at a first time...

...creating at least a second audio/video message on a second workstation at a second time later than the first time...

...placing the at least second audio/video message on the server in a temporally independent pseudo-chronology relative to the first audio/video message determined by a user at the second workstation...

Freeman does not disclose these features. Instead, Freeman discloses storing documents "in a chronologically ordered stream." (Col. 1, lines 4-6). Freeman's discussion of the "stream" discloses that the stream is a series of events that are stored in chronological order - that is, in real time, rather than in a "temporally independent pseudo-chronology" as recited in claim 42. Freeman discusses the real time series of events as follows:

A "stream" according to the present invention is a time-ordered sequence of documents that functions as a diary. . .Every document created and every document send [sic] to a person or entity is stored in a main stream. The tail of a stream contains documents from the past, for example starting with an

Appln. No.: 10/750,605

Amendment Dated February 14, 2008

Reply to Office Action of September 18, 2007

electronic birth certificate or articles of incorporation. Moving away from the tail and toward the present and future, that is, toward head of the stream more recent documents are found. . ." (Col. 4, lines 6-15)

Freeman also discloses that "[t]he stream preserves the order and method of document creation." (Col. 4, lines 26-27). It also discloses that "[c]reation of a document if [sic] 'transparent' because documents, by default, are added to the [sic] at the present time point." (Col. 4, lines 42-43). In contrast, claim 42 recites in part, placing audio/video messages in a temporally independent pseudo-chronology. For at least the above reasons, claim 42 and its dependent claims are not subject to rejection as anticipated by Freeman.

Claim 45 recites, in part:

...creating on the workstation at a first time a first audio/video message...

...creating on the workstation at a second time later than the first time at least a second audio/video message...

...placing the at least second audio/video message on the workstation in a temporally independent pseudo-chronology relative to the first audio/video message determined by a user of the workstation...

Claim 50 recites, in part:

...receiving on the workstation at a first time at least one audio/video message from a server...

...creating on the workstation at a second time later than the first time at least a second audio/video message...

...placing the at least second audio/video message on the workstation in a temporally independent pseudo-chronology relative to the at least first audio/video message determined by a user of the workstation...

Claim 52 recites, in part:

Appln. No.: 10/750,605

Amendment Dated February 14, 2008

Reply to Office Action of September 18, 2007

...receiving on the workstation at a first time a plurality of audio/video messages

in a first chronology from a server...

...creating on the workstation at a second time later than the first time at least a

second audio/video message...

...placing the at least second audio/video message on the workstation in a

sequence relative to the plurality of audio/video messages determined by a user

of the workstation to form a second temporally independent pseudo-chronology...

For the reasons explained above regarding claim 42, claim 45 and its dependent claims,

claim 50 and its dependent claim 51, and claim 52 and its dependent claim 53 are also not

subject to rejection as anticipated by Freeman.

Laves also does not disclose the above-recited claimed features. Laves is directed to a

display method and apparatus. The method arranges data from two sources (for example, from

a personal digital assistant and a computer) in the chronological time order in which the data

was created. The chronological order is identified by respective time stamps. The first data is

selected as a primary data field and the second data is selected as a subordinate data field if

the first time stamp is later than the second time stamp. (Col. 2, lines 7-12). Laves does not

disclose, for example,

placing the at least second audio/video message on the server in a temporally

independent pseudo-chronology relative to the first audio/video message

determined by a user of the second workstation

as recited in claim 42. Laves also does not disclose at least a temporally independent pseudo-

chronology that is recited in the other pending claims. Accordingly, none of the pending claims

are subject to rejection as anticipated by Laves.

Page 10 of 11

Appln. No.: 10/750,605 RPI-123US

Amendment Dated February 14, 2008

Reply to Office Action of September 18, 2007

For all of the above reasons, claims 42-53 are now in condition for allowance and applicant respectfully requests an early indication of allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacques L. Etkowicz, Reg. No. 41,738

Stanley Weinberg, Reg. No. 25,276

Attorneys for Applicants

JLE/SW/dhm

Attachments: Figures 1-32 (43 sheets)

Dated: February 14, 2008

✓ P.O. Box 980Valley Forge, PA 19482(610) 407-0700

P.O. Box 1596
Wilmington, DE 19899
(302) 778-2500

The Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 18-0350 for any additional fees, or any underpayment or credit for overpayment in connection herewith.